

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on August 7, 2008. With this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 8, 17, 25 and 28 are amended. Claims 3, 4, 23 and 24 are canceled. All pending claims are presented for reconsideration and allowance in view of the following remarks.

Interview Summary

On January 8, 2009, Examiner Abdin and John Veldhuis-Kroeze conducted a telephone interview to discuss the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103. A background discussion of the claimed concepts was presented, and the Chiu et al. (US Pub No: 2005/0030255 A1) and Moehrle et al. (US Patent No: 6599130) references were discussed relative to the independent claims. Proposed claim amendments were discussed, but no agreement was reached. The Examiner's time in conducting the interview is appreciated.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103

In section 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 12-20, 22-24 and 32-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiu et al. (US Pub No: 2005/0030255 A1), hereafter referred to as "Chiu," in view of Moehrle et al. (US Patent No: 6599130), hereafter referred to as "Moehrle." In support of the rejection, the Office Action stated:

(1) Regarding claim 1:

Chiu teaches (in Fig. 3) method of coordinating resources (i.e. content) of mobile computing devices (i.e. laptop computers, notebook PCs, PDAs) to jointly execute tasks (i.e. by joining the received content on the plurality of displays and forming a modular display) [0017-0019], the method comprising:

receiving a first gesture input (i.e. receiving gesture from input device such as keyboard, mouse device, motion detector) at a first mobile computing device (e.g. Laptop computer) [0021], [0023];

receiving a second gesture input (i.e. receiving gesture from input device such as keyboard, mouse device, motion detector) at a second mobile computing device (e.g. Laptop computer) [0021] ;

determining (indicating or recognizing) whether the first and second gesture inputs form one of a plurality of different gesture types (e.g. move content, delete content, or transpose content, created by mouse device, key board and motion detector) [0021-0025] and [0050];

and if it is determined that the first and second gesture inputs (i.e. input from the laptop computers) form the one of the plurality of different gesture types [0022], then combining resources (content) of the first and second mobile computing devices to jointly execute a particular task (i.e. forming modular display system) associated with the one of the plurality of different gesture types (note that each display (on the modular system display) associated with a particular gesture stack and content fed to a particular display through a stack; the displays communicate with each other within a peer-to-peer type system and each display is aware of neighboring display through the content propagation and forming a modular display) [0024-0025] and [0051].

wherein determining (recognizing) whether the first and second gesture inputs form the one of the plurality of different gesture types (e.g. transpose gesture) further comprises determining whether the first and second gesture inputs are synchronized in time (i.e. propagates in time) ([0021-0025], [0041] and [0050]).

Note that Chiu discloses gestures but Chiu does not explicitly disclose Synchronous gestures.

However, Moehrle in the same field of endeavor discloses synchronous gestures (column 2, lines 37-49, column 3, lines 55-60 and column 4, lines 35-60 and Fig. 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the method of synchronous gesture as taught by Moehrle in to the computing devices of Chiu so that the plurality of synchronous gesture could be determined. In this configuration the system would provide a reliable operation in the display devices with accurate data transmission (Moehrle, column 2, lines 30-49).

Applicant again respectfully traverses these interpretations of Chiu and Moehrle, and maintains that the combination of these cited references does not render obvious independent claim 1. Applicant again asserts the arguments and evidence presented in the Amendment filed on April 24, 2008 in support of this position. In section 12 of the present Office Action, the Examiner provided a response to those arguments, stating:

Applicants arguments filed on 04/24/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim1: Applicant argues that (1)" Moehrle teaches time and location synchronization of recorded gestures with a video, not determination as to whether first and second gestures are synchronous gesture types" . (2) Applicant further argues that the combination of Moehrle and Chiu cannot render independent claim 1 obvious.

In response (1), Examiner respectfully disagree Applicant's point of view. It should be noted that Applicant appears to misconstrue the teaching of Moehrle to be time and location synchronization of recorded gestures with a video. Moreover, Moehrle's reference clearly teaches first and second gestures are synchronous gesture (see Fig. 3). In column 4, lines 35-60 Moehrle discloses an antenna 55 which is indicated that a sessions may be remotely sent, accesses or shared by distance-learning techniques to facilitated remotely collaborated interpretation sessions. As indicated in Fig. 3. video processor 45 accept input from variety of sources (i.e. 57, VHS, DVD, MPEG) and transmitted to the interpretation layer 47 which governs gestures and comment recordation and displayed at 37. A session input line 65 is shown to synchronize together the interactive gestures i.e. interpretation layer determine or detect the first gesture (i.e. gesture input or interaction from 57) and the second gesture (i.e. gesture inputs from 37) and they are synchronous in time.

Even assuming that the applicant is correct in arguing that Moehrle's reference does not teach "determining whether the first and second gesture inputs form the one of the plurality of different Synchronous gesture types". The Examiner points out that Chiu alone would be sufficient to teach the above limitations. In paragraph [0024-0025] and Fig. 2, Chiu's reference implicitly teaches that the first and second gesture inputs (e.g. the directional arrows indicate with a propagation order from 00-01 and 01-02 and the propagation order will follow the direction of the gesture) from one of the plurality of different gesture type (e.g transpose gesture). After all the gesture inputs or interaction received through the multiple devices including touch screen, keyboard or other input devices, the gesture is interpreted at step 320 and recognized, determined at 340 (Fig. 3), [0029]) . Also note that the gesture based user interfaces that allow synchronous collaboration which is segmented in time.

In response (2), Examiner disagree Applicants points of view, that Claim 1 is rejected over Chiu in view of Moehrle. Chiu clearly teaches the limitations of claim 1 as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1. However, Examiner introduced Moehrle's reference to teach only synchronous gesture. Specifically Chiu's reference teaches that receiving a first gesture input (i.e. receiving gesture from input device such as keyboard, mouse device, motion detector) at a first mobile computing device (i.e. Laptop) [0021- 0023]; receiving a second gesture input (i.e. receiving gesture from input device such as keyboard, mouse device, motion detector) at a second mobile computing device (e.g. Laptop computer) [0021-0022] .

However, Chiu does not explicitly disclose that the first and second gestures are inputted from one of a plurality of different synchronous gesture type. However, Moehrle in the same field of endeavor teaches deictic gestures (i.e. deictic gesture may be register by mouse cursor, touch screen, or light pen, column 2, lines 50-55) with synchronization (column 3, lines 55-60). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to incorporate Moehrle with Chiu so that the plurality of synchronous gesture could be determined (see the discussion in claim 1 above). In doing so the system would provide a reliable operation in the display devices with accurate data transmission (Moehrle, column 2, lines 30-49). Therefore, the references of Moehrle and Chiu meet the claim limitations. Thus the Examiner's rationale for combination of Chiu and Moehrle is proper because this combination provides improvement over the Chiu and Moehrle and proper motivation that render an obvious combination.

Again, these interpretations of Chiu and Moehrle are respectfully traversed. Further, independent claim 1 is herein amended to include limitations from now canceled claims 3 and 4, as well as other clarifying language. As amended, claim 1 is believed to be even more clearly non-obvious over the combination of Chiu and Moehrle.

The Examiner has explicitly acknowledged that Chiu does not teach synchronous gestures, and again relies on Moehrle for providing this teaching. In fact, neither reference teaches synchronous gestures, the determination of whether first and second user gesture inputs received respectively at first and second mobile computing devices are of a synchronous gesture type, nor the combination of the resources of the first and second mobile computer devices **in response to** a determination being made that the first and second user gesture inputs received at the first and second mobile computing devices are of a synchronous gesture type. While Chiu may teach the combination of resources from multiple computing devices in response to a single gesture at one of the devices to jointly execute a particular task, Chiu clearly does not teach that the combination of the resources of the multiple computing devices is **in response to** a determination that two separate gesture inputs received at two separate mobile computing devices together form a synchronous gesture. See e.g., Chiu at paragraph [0021], at paragraph [0024], lines 9-12, and at paragraph [0048], lines 6-11. There is simply no teaching of the coordinated use of two separate gestures at two separate computing devices to control whether the resources of those two computing devices are combined to execute a task.

Further, the Examiner's statement that Chiu teaches "wherein determining (recognizing) whether the first and second gesture inputs form the one of the plurality of different gesture types (e.g. transpose gesture) further comprises determining whether the first and second gesture

inputs are synchronized in time (i.e. propagates in time) ([0021-0025], [0041] and [0050]),” is respectfully traversed. Chiu provides no such teaching or suggestion of time synchronization between first and second gesture inputs at first and second mobile computing devices. The cited paragraphs [0021]-[0025] describe “content propagation”, not propagation in time or synchronization in time as asserted by the Examiner. Likewise, cited paragraph [0041] describes propagation of content displayed at the time a single gesture is received, not propagation in time or synchronization in time as asserted. Paragraph [0050] also provides no such teaching.

Further still, Applicant traverses the Examiner’s new statements in section 12 of the Office Action that “Chiu alone would be sufficient to teach the above limitations” and that Chiu teaches that “[a]fter all the gesture inputs or interaction received through the multiple devices including touch screen, keyboard or other input devices, the gesture is interpreted at step 320 and recognized, determined at 340 (Fig. 3), [0029]) .” In paragraph [0029], Chiu clearly teaches that each gesture input is acted on alone, not in combination with other gesture inputs. For example, this paragraph of Chui states “[o]nce a gesture is received, the gesture is interpreted at step 320,” and “[i]n any case, once the gesture is interpreted in step 320, operation continues depending on the interpretation of the gesture.” There is no collaborative step taught by Chiu which would equate to the claim requirements of first and second gesture inputs being received at first and second mobile computing devices and the subsequent determination as to whether the first and second gestures together form a synchronous gesture which is used in determining whether to combine the resources of the first and second mobile computing devices.

Moehrle also fails to teach or suggest these limitations. It is not clear to Applicant why the Examiner states that “[i]t should be noted that Applicant appears to misconstrue the teaching of Moehrle to be time and location synchronization of recorded gestures with video.” As noted in the previously filed Amendment, Moehrle clearly states “[i]n general the present invention is accomplished by overlaying an interpretation layer on the video, or image layer, to record the deictic gestures of a viewer in time and location synchronization with the video, through a software application.” See Moehrle at col. 2, lines 36-41. It is also not clear to Applicant how the Examiner’s discussion in section 12 of the Office Action of antenna 55, video processor 45, “live

or recorded video sources” 57 (quoting Moehrle at col. 4, lines 43-45), interpretation layer 47, and session input line 65 are intended to be applied to the claims of the present application. Clarification is respectfully requested.

It appears that the Examiner is asserting that the video source constitutes the “gesture input at a first mobile computing device”, while a gesture from a touch screen 37 constitutes the “gesture input at a second mobile computing device”. If this is in fact the case, Applicant must respectfully traverse this interpretation. No interpretation consistent with the present application and claims, or consistent with the teachings of Moehrle would allow a source of video to which a gesture is being synchronized to be considered to itself be a gesture input. Such an interpretation would require Moehrle to be applied to Chiu completely out of context of the teachings of Chiu and completely out of context of the claimed invention. There is no gesture associated with a source of video. The issue of obviousness of claim 1 does not depend upon whether a source of video can be labeled a “gesture input”, but rather on whether two user gesture inputs at two separate mobile computing devices are received, and whether a determination is made as to whether those two gesture user inputs together form a synchronous gesture which results in the resources of those two mobile computing devices being combined to jointly execute a task. Neither Chiu nor Moehrle, alone or in combination, teach the limitations of claim 1 directed to this concept.

As amended, independent claim 1 is believed to more clearly distinguish from the teachings of both Chiu and Moehrle. As amended, the method of coordinating resources of mobile computing devices includes the steps: “receiving a second user gesture input at a second mobile computing device, wherein the first and second gesture inputs are received respectively at the first and second mobile computing devices prior to combining resources of the first and second mobile computing devices;” “determining whether the first and second user gesture inputs together form one of a plurality of different synchronous gesture types, wherein determining whether the first and second gesture inputs received at the first and second mobile computing devices form one of the plurality of different synchronous gesture types further comprises determining whether the first and second user gesture inputs received at the first and

second mobile computing devices are of corresponding types and are synchronized in time by being received within a predetermined time period of each other;” and “combining resources of the first and second mobile computing devices, in response to a determination being made that the first and second user gesture inputs received at the first and second mobile computing devices are of corresponding types and are synchronized in time to form one of the plurality of synchronous gesture types, to jointly execute a particular task associated with the one of the plurality of different synchronous gesture types.” It is respectfully submitted that this combination of limitations is not obvious in view of the combined teachings of Chiu and Moehrle. Reconsideration and allowance of independent claim 1 and dependent claims 5-15 are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 17 is directed to a system which coordinates resources of mobile computing devices to jointly execute tasks. As amended, the system includes “a first mobile computing device configured to receive a first user gesture input;” “a second mobile computing device configured to receive a second user gesture input;” “processing circuitry configured to determine whether the first and second user gesture inputs together form one of a plurality of different synchronous gesture types by determining whether the first and second gesture inputs are of corresponding types and are synchronized in time by being received within a predetermined time period of each other;” and “the first and second mobile computing devices being further configured to combine resources to jointly execute a particular task associated with the one of the plurality of different synchronous gesture types based upon whether it is determined that the first and second gesture inputs form the one of the plurality of different synchronous gesture types.”

In rejecting claim 17, the Office Action relied upon the analysis applied to claim 1. As argued above, neither of Chiu or Moehrle teach or suggest synchronous gesture determination in general, nor more specifically such determination by determining whether the first and second user gesture inputs are of corresponding types and are synchronized in time. Also, neither Chiu nor Moehrle teach first and second mobile computing devices configured to combine resources to jointly execute a task **based upon whether it is determined that the first and second**

gesture inputs are synchronous gestures. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of independent claim 17 and dependent claims 18-21, 25-35 are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 5 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiu in view of Moehrle as applied to claim 4, and further in view of Trantow (US Pub. No: 20030222917 A1). Claims 5 and 25 depend from independent claims 1 and 17 respectively. Since Trantow likewise does not teach the limitations of these independent claims which are missing from Chiu and Moehrle, the combination of Chiu, Moehrle and Trantow therefore cannot render dependent claims 5 and 25 obvious. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 5 and 25 are therefore also respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 8-10, 21 and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiu in view of Moehrle as applied to claim 4, and further view of Tran et al. (US Patent No: 61 57935), hereafter referred to a “Tran.” Claims 8-10, 21 and 28-30 each depend from one of independent claims 1 and 17. Since Tran likewise does not teach the limitations of these independent claims which are missing from Chiu and Moehrle, the combination of Chiu, Moehrle and Tran therefore cannot render dependent claims 8-10, 21 and 28-30 obvious. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 8-10, 21 and 28-30 are therefore also respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 6-7 and 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiu, Moehrle and Trantow, and further in view of Kinawi et al. (US Patent No: 6545669 D1), hereafter referred to as “Kinawi.” Claims 6-7 and 26-27 each depend from one of independent claims 1 and 17. Since Kinawi likewise does not teach the limitations of these independent claims which are missing from Chiu, Moehrle and Trantow, the combination of Chiu, Moehrle and Trantow and Kinawi therefore cannot render dependent claims 6-7 and 26-27 obvious. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 6-7 and 26-27 are therefore also respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 11 and 31 were rejected under § 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiu in view of Moehrle and Tran as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Kinawi. Claims 11 and 31 are dependent, respectively, on independent claims 1 and 17.

Since Kinawi and Tran likewise do not teach the limitations of these independent claims which were missing from Chiu and Moehrle, this combination cannot render claims 11 and 21 obvious. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 11 and 31 are therefore also respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /John D. Veldhuis-Kroeze/
John D. Veldhuis-Kroeze, Reg. No. 38,354
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244
Phone: (612) 334-3222
Fax: (612) 334-3312

JVK/jmt